

**REMARKS**

By the above actions, claims 1 and 4 have been amended, the amendment to claim 4 merely eliminating an inconsistency between amended claim 1 and claim 4. In view of these actions and the following remarks, further consideration of this application is requested.

Before proceeding further, the undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner and his Primary Examiner for their open-minded consideration of points raised at a personal interview conducted on July 23, 2008, as well as for their helpful comments which assisted the undersigned in formulating the above response. In particular, the Examiners noted that claim 1 did not require direct communication with other than the display server and thus encompasses communication between the query server and the client via the display server. Furthermore, the Examiner's expressed the view that claim 1 was unclear since the role of the user in initiating the query process was not set forth. Based on this input, claim 1 has been amended above to add the step of "initiating of a query process by an input from the user" and to indicate that "in response to said input at least partially overlapping in time with displaying of the display data set retrieved from the display data server, . . . , automatically sending directly from the at least one query data server, an input request for inputting of response data from the client to the user of the client." Thus, both of the Examiners' concerns have been addressed.

Turning now to the rejections, claims 1, 2, and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the disclosure of the Dyer et al. patent application publication, while claim 3 was rejected under § 103 based upon the combined teachings of the Dyer et al. publication and the Hewitt et al. patent application publication. However, to the extent that this rejection may relate to the claims as now presented, it is inappropriate for the following reasons.

As was pointed out at the interview, the prior art and Dyer in particular, do not teach simultaneously presenting to a user at a client computer, data obtained directly from multiple computer servers. In the case of Dyer, as noted in paragraph [0036], if the questionnaire is at a second location, the data is redirected to the second location by the display server. Likewise, in the case of search website, e.g., GOOGLE®, an example posed by the Examiners at the interview, even though search result data is displayed simultaneously with search

website data, the search site server goes out and retrieves result data from other servers and directs it to the client display, rather than establishing a direct link between multiple servers as shown in Fig. 1 of the present application and set forth in amended claim 1. As was pointed out to the Examiners, the present invention allows a information to be drawn from multiple sources and presented at the client without compromising proprietary information of the individual sources. Furthermore, paragraph [0039] of the present application gives the example where online questioning about the “Internet pages of various suppliers” is possible using Internet pages drawn “from different suppliers.” Furthermore, in the case of claim 2, assessment can be performed at yet a third location since “the response data input by the user in response to the input request are automatically transmitted to a feedback server,” e.g., at a marketing company.

The Hewitt et al. patent application publication is relied upon by the Examiner with regard to the synchronous display of the display data set and the input request so as to overlap in time. However, the teaching of the Hewitt et al. publication also teaches providing the information given to the user from the same source, i.e., the internet radio server in direct contrast to the method of the present invention in which data from different sources are brought together for simultaneous display to the user as noted above.

Thus, the present invention as defined by the amended claims cannot be considered to have been rendered obvious, let alone anticipated, by the teachings of the Dyer et al. publication, nor can the present invention be found to have been rendered obvious by the combined teachings of the Dyer et al. and Hewitt et al. publications. Thus, the rejections based upon the Dyer et al. publication and upon the Dyer et al. and Hewitt et al. publications should be withdrawn and such action is requested.

Claims 8-10 have been rejected under § 103 based upon the combined teachings of the Dyer et al. publication and the Lippiner et al. and Gorodetsky et al. publications, while claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under § 103 based upon the combined teachings of the Dyer et al. publication and the Musgrove patent. However, nothing in the Lippiner et al. and Gorodetsky et al. publications or the Musgrove patent can make up for the shortcomings of the Dyer et al. publication noted above. Thus, even if the features for which these references

are cited were to be utilized in the method of the Dyer et al. publication, the present invention as defined by amended claim 1 still would not result nor would it be rendered obvious because the Lippiner et al. and Gorodetsky et al. publications also do not teach the simultaneous display of data received directly from two different sources. Thus, withdrawal of these rejections are also requested.

Therefore, in the absence of new and more relevant prior art being discovered, this application should now be in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain, or new issues arise, after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and thereby facilitating prompt approval of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
David S. Safran  
Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C.  
PO Box 10064  
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: (703) 584-3273